



**FILED**

10-04-16  
04:59 PM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison  
Company (U 338E) for Approval of its Energy  
Savings Assistance and California Alternate  
Rates for Energy Programs and Budgets for  
Program Years 2015-2017.

Application 14-11-007

And Related Matters:

Application 14-11-009

Application 14-11-010

Application 14-11-011

**NOTICE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION OF  
THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY COUNCIL (EEC)**

October 4, 2016

Allan Rago  
Energy Efficiency Council  
4751 Arrow Highway  
Montclair, CA 91763  
909-281-3531 (ph/fax)  
[arago@qcsca.com](mailto:arago@qcsca.com)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338E) for Approval of its Energy Savings Assistance and California Alternate Rates for Energy Programs and Budgets for Program Years 2015-2017.

Application 14-11-007

And Related Matters:

Application 14-11-009

Application 14-11-010

Application 14-11-011

**NOTICE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION OF  
THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY COUNCIL (EEC)**

In accordance with rules 8.2, 8.3 and 8.5 of the Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Energy Efficiency Council (EEC), hereby gives notice of the following communication in the above referenced proceeding.

On the morning of Friday, September 30, 2016, from approximately 11:00 am to 11:30 am, Ortensia Lopez and Anna Solorio of the EEC met with James M. Ralph, Legal Advisor to CPUC President Michael Picker and Scott Murtishaw, Energy Advisor to President Picker. The meeting took place at the Commission's offices in San Francisco: 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102. The communication was initiated by Anna Solorio of the EEC and focused on the Proposed Decision (PD) and Alternate Proposed Decision (APD) of the investor-owned utilities for the CARE and ESA Programs.

During the discussion EEC members expressed our support for the APD and discussed the following:

- The delays to delivering energy savings that would occur if a "treat first" prioritization of high usage customers over low-usage customers were implemented. High usage customers should certainly be targeted but low-usage customers should not have to wait to be served before *all* high usage customers are served.

- The benefit of 23 new energy and water saving measures and standards that could benefit low-income customers if the go-back rule were suspended.
- The current process for finding customers that have not been served since 2002 and the challenges contractors face in finding these customers amongst those who have already been served.
- Need for expediency with not only issuing new programs and budgets but ensuring there is no delay in implementation by the utilities after approval.
- How bridge funding “froze the program in time” and why bridge funding did not facilitate the consistency envisioned by the CPUC.

In addition, EEC members expressed concern for the loss of jobs that would accompany the PD if it were approved. There were two handouts provided and we are attaching them here. The first is a presentation made by the EEC to the LIOB on July 20, 2016 titled ESA: A Program in Crisis and the second is a list of talking points.

October 4, 2016

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ *Allan Rago*

Allan Rago  
Energy Efficiency Council  
4751 Arrow Highway  
Montclair, CA 91763  
909-281-3531 (ph/fax)  
[arago@qcsca.com](mailto:arago@qcsca.com)